DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 199 SP 032 590

AUTHOR Whelan, Carol Scott; Duncan, Billy
TITLE An Evaluation of Louisiana's 1989-90 Model Career Options Program for Teachers.
PUB DATE Jun 90
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Career Development; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Helping Relationship; *Mentors; *Principals; *Program Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Secondary School Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Louisiana

ABSTRACT

The Louisiana Model Career Options Program (MCOP) is intended to encourage eligible, experienced teachers to explore new avenues in education and gain additional pay while remaining in the classroom. This evaluation provides information to decision makers at the state and local levels to assist them in making judgments about the extent to which the goals of the program have been attained and potential modifications needed. Three questionnaires were developed for each of the three groups involved in the MCOP: 21 principals, 21 mentor teachers and 21 interns (first-year teachers). The instruments were specifically oriented to the stated aims for and roles of intern, mentor, or principal. The mentor/intern instruments were closely correlated to determine mentor and intern perceptions and assessments of program elements. The first 30 items on the mentor and intern forms were designed to measure responses from members of each group relative to very specific functions or program elements. Findings revealed that the performance and/or program element was rated as adequate or better, with the exception that mentors did not feel that they were able to give the interns enough of their time. However, the interns indicated that the amount of time provided by the mentors was adequate. All groups rated the performance of the mentors and the program at above average levels. Some recommendations are made for program improvement. The data collection instruments are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323199

AN EVALUATION OF LOUISIANA'S 1989-90 MODEL CAREER OPTIONS PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS

PREPARED BY

Carol Whelan, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana
College of Education
USL Box 42051
Lafayette, LA 70504

and

Billy Duncan, Ed.D.
Professor of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana
College of Education
USL Box 42051
Lafayette, LA 70504

June, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Whelan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 032 590

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1. Introduction....1
   Background....1
   Purpose of the Evaluation....2
   Evaluation Questions....2
   Evaluation Audiences....3
2. Methodology....4
   Evaluation Procedures....4
3. Discussion of the Results....4
   Questionnaire Results....5
   Structured Telephone Interviews....17
4. Summary and Recommendations....20

Appendix....22
   Mentors' Questionnaire....23
   Interns' Questionnaire....32
   Principals' Questionnaire....40
   Mentors' Interview Guide....45
   Interns' Interview Guide....47
   Principals' Interview Guide....49

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

Table 1, Mentor Questionnaire Results.....10

Table 2, Intern Questionnaire Results.....11

Table 3, Principal Questionnaire Results.....12

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Louisiana Model Career Options Program (MCOP) is one of several educational reforms mandated by the "Children's First" Act of 1988. Funds for the development of the MCOP have been provided by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) through state monies. MCOP is intended to encourage eligible, experienced teachers to explore new avenues in education and gain additional pay while remaining in the classroom.

Participation in MCOP during the 1989-90 pilot testing of the Mentor Program part of MCOP involved 21 mentor teachers, 21 interns (first year teachers) and 21 principals from 21 parish school systems in Louisiana. The duration of the pilot was from various dates in February, 1990, until the end of the 1989-90 school year. All of the mentor teachers had received the LTIP/LaTEP-STAR (System for Teacher and Learning Assessment and Review) training. Pilot testing will continue in 1990-91. In 1991-92 MCOP is scheduled to be implemented statewide. At that time participation in MCOP will be voluntary for teachers who meet the eligibility criteria. The criteria require the participant:

1. to be a practicing Louisiana public school teacher with a minimum of seven years of teaching experience;

2. to hold a Master's degree;
3. to possess the required certification's and
4. to have received a superior rating under the statewide performance-based teacher evaluation program that is currently being developed.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation of the Model Career Options Program (MCOP) is to provide information to decision makers at the state and local levels to assist them in making judgements about the extent to which the goals of the program have been attained, and about potential modifications needed relative to the operation and administration of the program.

Evaluation Questions

The 1989-90 evaluation of the pilot MCOP focuses on three major groups: the mentor teachers, intern; i.e., first year, teachers and the school principals. Questionnaires were developed for the three groups to answer the following questions.

1. How satisfactory were the mentoring services perceived to be?
2. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
3. How might the program be improved?

Evaluation Audiences

The following are the major audiences for the evaluation and are considered legitimate recipients of evaluation reports:

1. The State Superintendent of Education and his Cabinet.
2. The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
3. Members of the Legislature's House and Senate Education Committees.
4. The State Department of Education's Bureau of Professional Accountability
5. The MCOP Advisory Committee.

METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Procedures

Evaluation of the 1989-90 MCOP program was initiated by the development of three Likert-type questionnaires, one for each of the three involved groups: principals, mentors, interns, i.e. first year teachers. Each instrument was devised on an eleven-point scale and was specifically oriented to the stated aims for and roles of intern, mentor, or principal. The mentor/intern instruments were, for the most part, closely correlated to determine mentor and intern perceptions and assessments of program elements and to provide a quantitative measure of differences in rated item values. All program participants were sent instruments to complete. Copies of the instruments can be found in the appendix.

Additionally, interview guides were developed for the purpose of interviewing, by telephone, some program participants. These individuals were selected by using a table of random numbers. The interviews served to cross-validate the information received from the questionnaires as well as to provide an opportunity for participants to supply any additional thoughts or information to the evaluators.

Discussion of the Results

All 21 principals and 21 mentors completed and returned their instruments. Eighteen of 21 interns returned completed questionnaires during the allotted time. Therefore, the findings,

relative to the interns, reflect the assessments of only eighteen rather than twenty-one individuals.

For care of reporting, the evaluators have enclosed questionnaire responses in the following manner: mentor responses will be designated by a capital M, principals by a P, and interns by an I. To illustrate, if a comparison is being made between item 12 an the mentor form and item 15 on the intern form, the items would be denoted as M12 and I15 respectively.

Questionnaire Results

The first thirty items on the mentor and intern forms were designed to measure responses from members of each group relative to very specific functions or program elements. The average ratings were, in some instances, almost identical. For example, item one dealt with mentor responses to intern requests for aid. With a value of ten being maximal for mentor response and promptness, the mentor average rating was 9.38, the intern rating 9.33.

Close agreement between mentors and interns occurred when asked about the utility of formal meetings. Interns rated this item at 7.89, mentors at 7.76. Averages between the two groups were fairly close regarding their perceptions of mentors and their orientation to others with the interns' average coming in at 8.61 and the mentors' at 8.19.

Interns rated the mentors as good listeners at an 8.78 level, while mentors thought the value to be 8.67. In helping interns with specific problems mentors gave themselves an average rating

of 8.00 while the interns thought they did better giving them an average score of 8.67.

Other items where the average ratings of mentors and interns were in close agreement (differences of 1.00 or less on rating averages) are as follows:

1. The success of informal meetings (M=7.52, I=8.50);
2. Mentor feelings of self-confidence (M=8.67, I=9.67);
3. Mentor assistance with daily planning and preparation (M=5.48, I=6.44);
4. Mentor provision of unit plans and syllabi (M=5.05, I=5.28);
5. Mentor commitment to students (M=8.71, I=9.28);
6. Mentor encouragement of interns own approach to use of own ideas and teaching style(s) (M=8.29, I=8.67);
7. Mentor assistance in developing a record-keeping system (M=6.19, I=6.06)
8. Mentor provision of hands-on assistance (M=6.57, I=7.44);
9. Mentor acceptance of intern as a colleague (M=9.76, I=9.17).

There were some considerable differences of opinions between the two groups on the average ratings (differences of 1.01 or greater) of some items. For example, when asked about the amount of time mentors were available to the interns, the mentors average stood at only 3.71. The interns, however, rated this item at 7.44. In short, mentors felt they were available for less than an

adequate amount of time; interns felt that they (mentors) were available to them to a slightly more than adequate degree. It is suggested that the differences in the average ratings of the two groups is twofold. (1) The interns probably tend to overrate because they are new and inexperienced. (2) Being in the position of "novice", the intern is going to be cautious about criticizing the "expert" mentor.

Other items where average ratings' differences exceeded 1.01 included the following:

1. Mentor assistance in helping interns understand local rules of school and community (M=6.86, I=8.33);
2. Mentor aid in getting along with significant others (M=6.33, I=8.22);
3. Mentor setting an example in pursuing research data about teaching (M=6.43, I=7.89);
4. Mentor assistance in the preparation of a professional development plan (M=5.57, I=7.89);
5. Mentor encouragement to get involved in professional enhancement activities (M=5.71, I=7.72);
6. Mentor resourcefulness in helping where problem solution were not obvious (M=6.71, I=8.27);
7. Open-mindedness of mentor (M=7.43, I=8.67);
8. Mentor aid in getting supplies (M=6.52, I=7.61);
9. Mentor aid in setting good classroom environment (M=6.29, I=7.56);
10. Mentor assistance in locating community resource

people (M=4.76, I=5.89);

11. Mentor aid in modifying teaching strategies (M=6.10, I=7.67);
12. Mentor ability to demonstrate classroom skills/techniques (M=7.81, I=9.11);
13. Mentor observation and feedback (M=6.00, I=7.78);
14. Mentor as a role model (M=7.43, I=8.67);
15. Support provided by the principal (M=7.10, I=8.61).

Observation of this group of items suggests that, for the most part, interns tended to rate mentor performances at a higher or more acceptable level than did the mentors themselves. It should be noted that this might be the result of one or more factors such as: 1. The tendency of subordinates (interns) to rate those (mentors) in perceived higher status positions favorably; 2. Differences in experience background, experiences that color perceptions differently; 3. Background and experience differentials that result in different interpretations and/or connotations between less experienced interns and more experienced teachers; and 4. The tendency of individuals to "modestly" rate themselves.

What is most noteworthy, perhaps, is the overall assessment of the questionnaire items. Despite the degree of difference in mentor and intern average values on any respective item, the performance and/or program element was rated as adequate or better with one exception -- the fact that mentors did not feel they were able to give interns enough of their time. In short,

mentors and interns (based on their rating) see this as a viable program.

All involved groups rated the performances of the mentors at an above-average level (M=8.14, I=9.11, P=9.19). Average ratings indicate that the mentors perceived themselves to be less competent than did the principals and interns.

All involved groups rated the program at an above average level (M=7.57, P=7.77, I= 7.89). In fact, it is interesting to note how closely the average rating correlated-the range from the lowest (M=7.57) to the highest (I=7.89) involved a differential of only .32. This seems to indicate very close agreement among the groups that the program was indeed very successful.

Principals, for the most part, rated program elements and their own activities from being more than adequate to being very successful. The one exception to this rule was the average rating for an item about the use of other administrators in the planning of the program (4.57). This value indicates that they, as principals, did not view this as an extremely important need. Tables 1, 2, and 3 provide questionnaire results including means, and standard deviations for each question.

The majority of program participants indicated feelings that the MCOP program could produce many of the outcomes that have been suggested as possible results from program implementation. Evaluators asked them to react to five of those outcomes, voting yes if they felt the program could help produce the result and no if not. They were then asked to prioritize each of the five,

Table 1

Mentors' Questionnaire Responses

Question #	Total No. of Responses	Total No. of Pts.	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	21	189	9.00	1.02
2	21	159	7.57	1.53
3	21	163	7.76	1.97
4	21	158	7.52	2.00
5	21	144	6.86	1.75
6	21	133	6.33	2.73
7	21	135	6.43	2.26
8	21	117	5.57	2.54
9	21	120	5.71	2.47
10	21	141	6.71	1.61
11	21	156	7.43	1.65
12	21	172	8.19	1.53
13	21	182	8.67	1.43
14	21	168	8.00	1.35
15	21	182	6.67	1.17
16	21	115	5.48	2.87
17	21	106	5.05	2.66
18	21	137	6.52	2.36
19	21	132	6.29	2.37
20	21	100	4.76	2.56
21	21	128	6.10	2.24
22	21	164	7.81	1.50
23	21	183	8.71	1.03
24	21	174	8.29	1.67
25	21	130	6.19	2.44
26	21	78	3.71	2.60
27	21	138	6.57	1.94
28	21	126	6.00	2.02
29	21	156	7.43	1.53
30	21	205	9.76	.53
31	21	168	8.00	1.23
32	21	171	8.14	1.25
33	21	135	6.43	2.75
34	21	161	7.67	2.49
35	21	149	7.10	2.29
36	21	158	7.52	2.01
37	21	159	7.57	1.88

Table 2

Interns' Questionnaire Responses

Question #	Total No. of Responses	Total No. of Pts.	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	18	168	9.33	.88
2	18	164	9.11	1.05
3	18	142	7.89	1.82
4	18	153	8.33	1.77
5	18	150	8.33	1.63
6	18	148	8.22	1.44
7	18	142	7.89	2.11
8	18	142	7.89	2.11
9	18	139	7.72	2.52
10	18	149	8.28	1.37
11	18	156	8.67	1.53
12	18	155	8.61	1.25
13	18	158	8.78	1.13
14	18	156	8.67	1.45
15	18	174	9.67	.67
16	18	116	6.44	3.20
17	18	95	5.28	3.87
18	18	137	7.61	2.97
19	18	136	7.56	2.41
20	18	106	5.89	3.80
21	18	138	7.67	2.52
22	18	164	9.28	1.20
23	18	167	9.28	.87
24	18	156	8.67	1.83
25	18	106	6.06	3.58
26	18	134	7.44	2.61
27	18	134	7.44	2.71
28	18	140	7.78	1.78
29	18	156	8.67	1.11
30	18	165	9.17	1.07
31	18	164	9.11	.99
32	18	155	8.61	2.58
33	18	142	7.89	1.63

Table 3

Principals' Questionnaire

Question #	Total Number of Responses	Total No. of Pts.	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	21	183	8.71	1.52
2	21	165	7.86	1.96
3	21	161	7.67	1.96
4	21	150	7.14	2.12
5	21	170	8.10	2.16
6	21	136	6.48	2.17
7	21	170	8.10	3.26
8	21	140	6.67	2.38
9	21	91	4.43	2.25
10	21	172	8.19	1.82
11	21	96	4.57	1.94
12	21	193	9.19	1.05
13	21	148	7.05	2.47
14	21	163	7.77	1.98

giving the most important one a rank of one and the others then in descending order of importance. The suggested outcomes offered for assessment were as follows: MCOP will

1. Provide an opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to become master teachers;
2. Provide an opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to engage in professional activities over and beyond classroom teaching;
3. Allow Louisiana's teachers more and different options for career advancement;
4. Allow for the overall enhancement of teaching salaries, especially those opting for MCOP options;
5. Provide Louisiana with a more flexible and professionally competent cadre of teachers.

Principals voted as follows:

1. Item one, 21 yes, 0 no;
2. Item two, 21 yes, 0 no;
3. Item three, 20 yes, 1 no;
4. Item four, 17 yes, 4 no;
5. Item 5, 19 yes, 2 no.

Mentors voted 21 yes and 0 no on all items except number one. The vote on that item was 19 yes and 2 no. Intern voting was as follows:

1. Item one, 18 yes, 0 no;
2. Item two, 17 yes, 1 no;
3. Item three, 16 yes, 2 no;

4. Item four, 15 yes, 3 no;

5. Item five, 14 yes, 4 no.

Principals felt that the top priority item was number two, giving it an average rating of 2.65. Success item ratings were: number five, 2.68; number three, 2.80; numbers four, 2.95; and number ones, 3.40.

Mentors made item number two their top priority at a value of 2.29. Other item ratings were: Item five, 2.81; item four, 2.86; item three, 2.95; and item one, 3.71.

Interns afforded item three their number one slot at a rating average of 2.56. Other values from this group were: Item two, 2.61; item five, 2.83; item one, 3.06; and item four, 3.17.

Assessment of the priority rankings indicated that all groups place much importance on improving the teachers' roles and options and upon improving quality of instruction. Oddly, economic considerations were seen as a lower priority by program participants.

While overall item averages were almost universally positive, program evaluators feel compelled to point out that there are some individual item ratings that require consideration by future program planners. For example, four principals indicated that they used no other administrators in program planning, while two others indicated almost no use of such personnel. One principal reported no evaluation effort with the mentor and intern.

Four mentors indicated little felt need to help interns get along with significant others. Two mentors showed little interest

in helping their charges with research needs. At least five mentors showed less than adequate aid with regard to professional development plans, in professional enhancement activities, assistance with daily planning, or assistance with unit plans and syllabi. Identification of resource people was seen as low priority by at least eight mentors. Four mentors said they gave inadequate help with record keeping. Twelve suggested they spent less than an adequate amount of time with their interns. Five mentors expressed little enthusiasm for the contact logs.

While interns tended to rate mentor performances and assistance at a slightly higher level than did the mentors themselves, their ratings reflect the mentor assessments reported in the previous paragraph. The intern assessments seem to verify the performances and attitudes of the mentors.

All program participants were asked to offer comments and/or suggestions relative to the MCOP program. Also, all were asked to suggest possible topics for in-service training sessions.

Three interns suggested that mentors and interns should be teaching the same subjects at the same level. Two indicated that it would be better to locate mentor and intern at the same school site. Three suggested utilizing the program for beginning teachers, while one individual thought interns should be allowed to observe different teachers and another suggested it might be a good program for some experienced teachers. Six of the interns commented that the program, in an overall sense of the word, is excellent.

Several topics were suggested by the interns for in-service topics. The topics listed and the number of interns making that suggestion are as follows:

1. Classroom discipline (2);
2. Motivation techniques (1);
3. Records management (2);
4. Locating resources (1);
5. Teaching strategies (3);
6. Steps and processes of the MCOP program (1);
7. Dealing with parents (1);
8. Organizing learning tasks (1).

Five mentors suggested that the program should begin at an earlier time in the school year. Three suggested a need for more orientation to the program. Four mentors said more release time was in order while three said that mentors and interns should be at the same level and teaching the same subjects. One mentor rated the contact log as excellent; ten rated the overall program excellent.

In-service topics suggested by mentors (the number in parentheses) were numerous. Topics and numbers suggesting were:

1. Classroom management (3);
2. Discipline (3);
3. Record keeping (1);
4. Time management (2);
5. Writing unit plans (2);
6. Handling stress (2);

7. Leadership skills (1);
8. Listening skills (1);
9. Positive reinforcement (1);
10. Coping with change (innovations) (1).

Two principals commented on the need for more planning time. Better efforts at matching interns and mentors was suggested by two principals, also. One principal suggested each of the following for consideration:

1. More in-service for principals who work with the program;
2. More released time for MCOP teachers;
3. Travel pay for MCOP teachers;
4. Expand the program;
5. Earlier starting date;
6. Mentor concept excellent.

Eight of the principals rated the overall program as excellent.

Four principals suggested an orientation to the MCOP Program as an in-service topic. One individual suggested a session on explanation of various program components.

Structured Telephone Interviews

Structured interviews were conducted with a random sample of the participants including five mentors, five principals and four interns. A sample of the interview guide can be found in the appendix. Four of the five mentors felt the MCOP was superior to the traditional methods employed to introduce new teachers to the

system. The four interns felt the program was superior and five principals felt that the program was superior to the traditional methods used.

Four out of the five mentors felt that they had adequate support in their mentoring efforts. All four of the interns interviewed felt they received adequate support. Three of the five principals felt they received adequate support, one said it was moderately accurate and another answered that the program had good potential but was too rushed. When asked "What was the value of the mentor role?", the mentors had various responses ranging from:

1: "Knowing I'm on a different ladder makes me feel like I can go somewhere."(1);

2. "I learned from the intern," (1);

3. "Excellent program" (1);

4. "Don't know"; (1)

5. "Gave me confidence"; (1).

Of the four interns that responded to the same question all four said it helped them. The five principals all agreed that the mentor helped the new intern teacher. When asked about the overall value of the program, one mentor said it was "excellent", three said it was "good" and one said it "was needed". The four interns responding, said it was: "a great program", (1); "very valuable", (1); "good program" (1) and "would be better if the mentor and assessment intern were more closely matched (1) (grade level or subject matter taught)." The principals comments about the overall program value were as follows: "potential is good";

"excellent"; "great program"; and "important, we should have it"; and "gives support and stability to teachers".

When asked for comments and suggestions, the most common suggestion was to start the program earlier (at the beginning of the school year). The second most common suggestion was to select better matches between mentors and interns (for example either have them working at the same grade level, if they are elementary teachers, or the same subject if they are secondary level teachers).

4

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

On all three sets of questionnaires the performance and/or program element was rated as adequate or better with the exception that mentors did not feel they were able to give the interns enough of their time. The interns indicated that the amount of time provided by the mentors was adequate. It is suggested that the difference in the average ratings of the two groups could be due to the fact that the interns tend to overrate because they are new and inexperienced and would tend to be cautious about criticizing the "expert" mentor.

All involved groups rated the performances of the mentors at an above average level and all involved groups rated the program at an above average level. (M=7.57, P=7.77, I=7.89). This seems to indicate very close agreement among the groups that the program was indeed very successful. This was also confirmed in the telephone interviews.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered on the basis of the 1989-90 Model Career Options Program (MCOP).

1. The Model Career Options Program should continue in the 1990-91 school year.
2. The MCOP should begin prior to the opening of school in the 1990-91 school year, so that in-services could be

held and mentor teachers would be better prepared to work with the intern teachers.

3. The mentor teachers should be allocated scheduled time to work with and meet with the intern teachers.
4. When matching mentors to interns, it is recommended that they come from similar backgrounds. For example, at the elementary level teachers from like grade levels could be matched while at the secondary level, teachers who taught the same subject could be matched.

APPENDIX

DATA COLLECTION

INSTRUMENTS

Check the level that you are currently teaching.
_____ k-4 _____ 5-8 _____ 9-12

MENTORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please respond to the following items by making the choice that you feel most adequately represents your individual assessment of (reaction to) each given item. All responses will be treated in a confidential manner -- NO INDIVIDUAL'S RESPONSES WILL BE IDENTIFIED. Any and all evaluative analyses will be conducted in a manner which will assure anonymity of individual responses.

Please respond to all items on the instrument and provide us with your best judgement(s).

1. As a mentor, I responded to aid requests from my assigned intern:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Immediately and without fail — Almost always — Most of the time — Sometimes — Seldom

2. In my efforts to provide assistance to my intern, I feel that I was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Extremely flexible — Very flexible — Flexible — Somewhat flexible — Totally inflexible

3. I would rate the formal (scheduled) meetings with my intern as being:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Extremely helpful — Very helpful — Helpful enough — Not helpful enough — Of no help

4. I would rate my informal (daily) meetings with my intern as being:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Extremely helpful — Very helpful — Helpful enough — Not helpful enough — Of no help

5. I assisted my intern in his/her understanding and incorporation of the written and unwritten rules of the school and community:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Totally | Most of the time | Adequately | Rarely | Never

6. As a mentor, I feel that I helped show my intern how to get along with significant others (students, colleagues, parents, administrators):

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an extremely significant degree | To a significant degree | To an adequate degree | To a less than adequate degree | Not at all

7. I demonstrate to my intern why he/she needs to become well-informed with regard to knowledge about research findings, methodology, and new educational materials:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional significant degree | To a significant degree | To an adequate degree | To a less than adequate degree | Not at all

8. I was concerned about and assisted my intern with the formulation of the professional development plan:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

In every manner possible | Almost all of the time | To an adequate degree | Some of the time | Never

9. I informed my intern about and encouraged him/her to become involved in activities (workshops, conferences, study groups etc...) which would enhance his/her professional growth:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree | To a significant degree | To an adequate degree | To a limited degree | Not at all

10. In situations where there were no obvious solutions to problems, I feel that I was able to show my intern how to be resourceful:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
To an extreme degree		To a significant degree			Adequately		To a limited degree			Not at all

11. Based on our association, I feel that my intern would rate me as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely open-minded		Highly open-minded			Open-minded		Somewhat open-minded			Close-minded

12. Based on our association, I feel my intern would rate me as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely people-oriented		Highly people oriented			People-oriented		Somewhat people-oriented			Not people-oriented

13. Where my intern expressed a need to talk to someone, I tried to be:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
A highly attentive listener		An attentive listener			A good listener		A sometimes listener			A non-listener

14. In dealing with my intern's general problems, I feel that I:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Was greatly greatly empathetic		Showed much empathy			Showed enough empathy		Showed little empathy			Expressed no empathy

15. If asked about my confidence in my ability, my intern would probably rate me as one who is:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Extremely confident | Highly confident | Confident | Not Too confident | Not at all confident

16. I assisted my intern in his/her daily planning and preparation for teaching:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree | To a substantial degree | Adequate | Less than adequately | Hardly at all

17. I provided examples of unit plans and syllabi for my intern:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

In every instance | Most of the time | About one-half the time | Rarely | Never

18. I assisted my intern in the acquisition of needed supplies and materials:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 8

To an exceptional degree | To a substantial degree | Adequately | Less than adequately | Hardly at all

19. I feel that I helped my intern to establish a good learning environment:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree | To a significant degree | Adequately | To a less than adequate degree | Not at all

20. I assisted my intern in the identification of resource people in the district:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree | To a substantial degree | To an adequate degree | To a limited degree | Not at all

21. I helped my intern to modify teaching strategies when needed:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
In every instance		Almost always			Enough of the time			Rarely		Never

22. In the demonstration of classroom skills and/or techniques, I feel my intern would rate me as:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Superior		Above average			Average			Fair		Very poor

23. With regard to my commitment to students, my intern would rate me as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Exceptionally committed		Significantly committed			adequately committed			not adequately committed		not at all committed

24. I encouraged my intern to try his/her own ideas, teaching style, and classroom management techniques:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
All of the time		Most of the time			About one-half of the time			Rarely		Never

25. I showed my intern how to and assisted him/her to develop, prepare, and maintain a sound record-keeping program:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
In every instance		To a significant degree			Adequately			Less than adequately		Not at all

26. The amount of time available to work with my assigned intern was:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
More than adequate to to provide assistance(s)					Exactly the right amount of time to provide needed services				Totally inadequate to provide needed services	

27. If asked to rate me with reference to my hands-on assistance to him/her, my intern would find me:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Superior			Above average			Average		Fair		Very poor

28. If asked about my observations of activities and providing feedback, my intern would feel I was:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Of tremendous help			Of great help			Very helpful		Somewhat helpful		Not at all helpful

29. If asked to rate me as a role model, my intern would suggest I am:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
The Ultimate example			An excellent example			A good example		A fair example		A poor example

30. I tried to make my intern feel as if he/she was:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
An equal and valued colleague			A colleague but of slightly lesser statue			A colleague who must earn his/her own niche		Less than a colleague		A sub-ordinate student

31. If asked about the overall assistance I provided, my intern would suggest that I was:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly competent			Above average with regard to competency			Average with regard to competency		Slightly below average with regard to competency		Incompetent

32. If asked to rate me as teacher and mentor, my intern would find me to be:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Exceptional		Above average			Average		Fair		Very poor	

33. The use of the mentor contact log has proven to be:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Of exceptional value		Of significant value			Adequately helpful		Of some value		of no value	

34. My principal supported the program and my efforts:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
To an exceptional degree		To a substantial degree			Adequately		Less than adequately		Not at all	

35. I would rate my principals efforts in this program as:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Maximal		Very good			Adequate		Less than adequate		Very poor	

36. As "based material with which to work", I would rate my intern as:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Exceptional		Above average			Average		Fair		Very poor	

37. As a mentor, I feel that the services provided to my intern were:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Of the highest caliber		Above average			Average		Slightly less than average		Of very poor quality	

SECTION II

II. There have been several suggested outcomes to be realized from a successful implemented MCOP program. Having been a participant in the pilot program, you are uniquely qualified to provide information relative to the ability of this program to produce those suggested results and to additionally offer an insider view as to the relative importance of each.

a. In the five items below, please check yes for each of the following items if you feel the program can achieve the stated outcome; no if you feel that it cannot.

b. From your perspective, prioritize the items in terms of their importance and impact -- a rating of ONE being most important and the successive items of lesser importance in a rank ordered sequence.

A. 1. Provide an opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to become master teachers.

_____yes _____no priority # _____

2. Provide opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to engage in professional activities over and beyond teaching such as curriculum development, assisting teacher interns, providing workshop and related in-service activities, and materials development.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

3. Allow Louisiana's teachers more and different options for career advancement.

_____yes _____ no priority #_____

4. Allow for the overall enhancement of teaching salaries for Louisiana's teachers, especially those opting for one of the MCO options.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

5. Provide Louisiana with a more flexible and professionally competent cadre of teachers.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

SECTION III

1. Please feel free to offer any comments and/or suggestions you might have with reference to the MCOP program. You may criticize, praise, or offer suggestions and/or modifications you think feasible. We appreciate your efforts in this matter.

2. What inservice topics do you feel would be helpful to you for future training in the MCOP program?

Please check the level that you are currently teaching.
_____ k-4 ____ 5-8 ____ 9-12

INTERNS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please respond to the following items by making the choice that you feel most adequately represents your individual assessment of (reaction to) each given item. All responses will be treated in a confidential manner -- NO INDIVIDUAL'S RESPONSES WILL BE IDENTIFIED. Any and all evaluative analyses will be conducted in a manner which will assure anonymity of individual responses.

Please respond to all items on the instrument and provide us with your best judgment(s).

SECTION 1

1. My mentor responded to requests for assistance:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Immediately and without fail		Almost always		Most of the time			Sometimes			Seldom

2. In his/her efforts to provide overall assistance, my mentor proved to be:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely flexible		Very flexible		Flexible			Somewhat flexible			Totally inflexible

3. I would rate my formal (scheduled) meetings with my mentor as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely helpful		Very helpful		Helpful enough			Not Helpful enough			Of no help

4. I would rate my informal (daily) meetings with my mentor as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely helpful		Very helpful		Helpful enough			Not helpful enough			of no help

5. My mentor helped me to understand and incorporate both the written and unwritten rules of the school and community:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Totally		Most of the time		Adequately			Rarely			Never

6. My mentor, by his/her actions showed me how to best get along with significant others (students, colleagues, parents, administrators):

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
To an extremely significant degree		To a significant degree		To an adequate degree			To a than adequate degree			Not at all

7. My mentor, by his/her example, demonstrated to me a need to become well-informed with reference to knowledge about research findings, methodology, and new educational materials:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
To an exceptional degree		To an significant degree		To an adequate degree			To a less than adequate degree			Not at all

8. My mentor expressed concern over and offered assistance in helping me formulate a professional development plan:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
In every possible manner		Almost all of the time		To an adequate degree			Some of the time			Never

9. My mentor informed me about and encouraged me to become involved in activities (workshops, conferences, study groups, etc...) which would enhance my professional growth:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
To an exceptional degree		To a significant degree		To an adequate degree			To a limited degree			Not at all

10. When there were no obvious solutions to problems, I found my mentor to be:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely resourceful		Highly resourceful		Resourceful			Somewhat resourceful			Unable to assist in finding solutions

11. Based on our association, I would rate my mentor as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely open-minded		Highly open-minded		Open-minded			Somewhat open-minded			Close-minded

12. Based on our association, I would rate my mentor as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely people-oriented		Highly people-oriented		People-oriented			Somewhat people oriented			Not people-oriented

13. When I need to talk to someone, I found my mentor to be:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
A highly attentive		An attentive listener		A good listener			Not too interested in my comments			Totally disinterested

14. In helping me deal with problems, I feel that my mentor displayed:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Great empathy		Much empathy		Enough empathy			Too little empathy			No empathy

15. With reference to confidence in his/her ability, I would rate my mentor as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Extremely confident		Highly confident		Confident			Not too confident			Not at all confident

16. My mentor assisted me in my daily planning and preparation for teaching:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
To an exceptional degree		To a substantial degree		Adequately			Less than adequately			Hardly at all

17. My mentor provided me with examples of unit plans and syllabi:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

In every instance	Most of the time	About one-half the time	Rarely	Never

18. My mentor assisted me in the acquisition of needed supplies and materials:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree	To a substantial degree	Adequately	Less than adequately	Hardly at all

19. My mentor assisted me in establishing a good learning environment in the classroom:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree	To a significant degree	adequately	To a less than helpful	Not at all

20. My mentor assisted me in the identification of resource people in the district:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree	To a substantial degree	To an adequate degree	To a limited degree	Not at all

21. My mentor helped me to modify my teaching strategies when needed:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

In every instance	Almost always	Enough of the time	Rarely	Never

22. With reference to his/her ability to demonstrate classroom skills and/or techniques, my mentor was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Superior	Above Average	Average	Fair	Very Poor

23. My mentor demonstrated a commitment to students:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To an exceptional degree	To a significant degree	To an adequate degree	To a less than adequate degree	Not at all

24. My mentor encouraged me to try my own ideas, teaching style, and classroom management techniques:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

All of the time	Most of the time	About one-half the time	Rarely	Not at all

25. My mentor assisted me in the development, preparation, and maintenance of a record-keeping system:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

In every instance	To a significant degree	To an adequate degree	To a less than adequate degree	Not at all

26. The amount of time my mentor was available to me was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

More than adequate to meet my needs	Exactly the right amount of time to to provide needed services	Totally inadequate to provide needed assistance

27. In providing direct, hands-on assistance, my mentor was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Superior	Above average	Average	Fair	Very poor

28. With reference to his/her observations of my activities and the accompanying feedback, my mentor was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Of tremendous help	Of great help	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not at all helpful

29. As a role model, I found my mentor to be:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
The ultimate example		An excellent example		A good example			A fair example			A poor example

30. My mentor made me feel as though I was:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
An equal and valued colleague		A colleague of slightly lesser stature		A colleague who must earn his/her niche			Less than a colleague			A sub-ordinate student

31. With regard to the assistance provided to me as a teacher intern, I would rate my mentor as:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Highly competent		Above average with regard to competency		Average with regard to competency			Slightly below average with regard to competency			Very poor with regard to competency

32. I would rate the principal's support and efforts as:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Maximal		Very good		Adequate			Less than adequate			Very poor

33. With regard to the assistance provided to me as a teacher intern, I would rate this program from an overall point of view as being:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Exceptional		Above average		Average			Fair			Very poor

SECTION II

II. There have been several suggested outcomes to be realized from a successful implemented MCOP program. Having been a participant in the pilot program, you are uniquely qualified to provide information relative to the ability of this program to produce those suggested results and to additionally offer an insider view as to the relative importance of each.

a. In the five items below, please check yes for each of the following items if you feel the program can achieve the stated outcome; no if you feel that it cannot.

b. From your perspective, prioritize the items in terms of their importance and impact -- a rating of ONE being most important and the successive items of lesser importance in a rank ordered sequence.

A. 1. Provide an opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to become master teachers.

_____yes _____no priority # _____

2. Provide opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to engage in professional activities over and beyond teaching such as curriculum development, assisting teacher interns, providing workshop and related in-service activities, and materials development.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

3. Allow Louisiana's teachers more and different options for career advancement.

_____yes _____ no priority #_____

4. Allow for the overall enhancement of teaching salaries for Louisiana's teachers, especially those opting for one of the MCO options.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

5. Provide Louisiana with a more flexible and professionally competent cadre of teachers.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

SECTION III

1. Please feel free to offer any comments and/or suggestions you might have with reference to the MCOP program. You may criticize, praise, or offer suggestions and/or modifications you think feasible. We appreciate your efforts in this matter.

2. What inservice topics do you feel would be helpful to you for future training in the MCOP program?

PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please respond to the following items by making the choice that you feel most adequately represents your individual assessment of (reaction to) each given item. All responses will be treated in a confidential manner -- NO INDIVIDUAL'S RESPONSES WILL BE IDENTIFIED. Any and all evaluative analyses will be conducted in a manner which will assure anonymity of individual responses.

Please respond to all items on the instrument and provide us with your best judgment(s).

1. I feel that my efforts to "match" interns and mentors to be sure they were compatible:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Were tremendously successful	Were highly successful	Were successful enough	Were not adequate	Failed

2. My orientation efforts with regard to the MCOP program were:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Tremendously successful	Highly successful	Adequate -	Not adequate	Were very poor

3. My social gathering for mentor and intern to "break the ice" proved to be:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Tremendously successful	Very successful	Successful enough	Less than successful	A failure

4. My planned in-service for mentors and interns was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Very successful	Successful	Adequate	Not adequate	Very poor

5. My efforts to provide ample opportunities for mentor and intern communication with my office were:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Very successful	Successful	Adequate	Not adequate	Very poor

6. I feel that the time I allowed for the mentor and intern to share their experiences with me was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Maximal | More than adequate | Adequate | Less than adequate | Too little

7. I used other administrative personnel in my planning:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

To a substantial degree | To a high degree | To an adequate degree | Less than adequaltely | Not at all

8. The evaluation I conducted along with the mentor and intern was:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Of tremendous value | Of great value | Adequate | Less than adequate | Very poor

9. I feel that the program should be modified:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Significantly | Greatly | Some | Very little | Not at all

10. I would rate the potential of the intern as:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Very high | High | Average | Below average | Very low

11. I would rate the performance of the intern as:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor

12. I would rate the performance of the mentor as:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Poor

13. I feel that the aid and support provided to me as a MCO principal were:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Of the highest order		Were above average			Adequate			Less than adequate		Very poor

14. I rate this program as:

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent			Very good		Good			Fair		Poor

SECTION II

II. There have been several suggested outcomes to be realized from a successful implemented MCOP program. Having been a participant in the pilot program, you are uniquely qualified to provide information relative to the ability of this program to produce those suggested results and to additionally offer an insider view as to the relative importance of each.

a. In the five items below, please check yes for each of the following items if you feel the program can achieve the stated outcome; no if you feel that it cannot.

b. From your perspective, prioritize the items in terms of their importance and impact -- a rating of ONE being most important and the successive items of lesser importance in a rank ordered sequence.

A. 1. Provide an opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to become master teachers.

_____yes _____no priority # _____

2. Provide opportunity for some Louisiana teachers to engage in professional activities over and beyond teaching such as curriculum development, assisting teacher interns, providing workshop and related in-service activities, and materials development.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

3. Allow Louisiana's teachers more and different options for career advancement.

_____yes _____ no priority #_____

4. Allow for the overall enhancement of teaching salaries for Louisiana's teachers, especially those opting for one of the MCO options.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

5. Provide Louisiana with a more flexible and professionally competent cadre of teachers.

_____yes _____no priority #_____

SECTION III

1. Please feel free to offer any comments and/or suggestions you might have with reference to the MCOP program. You may criticize, praise, or offer suggestions and/or modifications you think feasible. We appreciate your efforts in this matter.

2. What inservice topics do you feel would be helpful to you for future training in the MCOP program?

INTERVIEW GUIDE: MENTOR

MCOP - MAY 1990

I. "Break the ice".

II. Do you feel that the MCOP program is superior or inferior to the traditional methods that have been used for new teachers in your system?

_____

_____

_____

III. Did you get adequate support in your efforts?

a. general support?_____

b. supplies and materials? _____

c. demonstrations ? _____

d. role modeling? _____

e. aid with day -to -day planning? _____

f. aid in evaluating? _____

IV. Which contacts with your intern were of more value - formal or informal? Why?

_____

_____

_____

V. What was the value of the mentor role?

_____

_____

_____

VI. What was the value of the principal with regard to the program?

_____

_____

VII. Do you feel that the program will become a viable force in the enhancement of the teacher's (a) role, (b) value to the system, (c) stature?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

VIII. What is your feeling about the overall value of the program?

_____

_____

_____

IX. Comments and suggestions.

_____

_____

_____

INTERVIEW GUIDE: INTERN

MCOP - MAY 1990

I. "Break the ice".

II. Do you feel that the MCOP program is superior or inferior to the traditional methods that have been used for new teachers in your system?

_____

_____

_____

III. Did you get adequate support in your efforts?

a. general support?_____

b. supplies and materials? _____

c. demonstrations ? _____

d. role modeling? _____

e. aid with day -to -day planning? _____

f. aid in evaluating? _____

IV. Which mentor contacts were of more value - formal or informal?

_____

_____

_____

V. What was the value of the mentor role?

_____

_____

_____

VI. What was the value of the principal with regard to the program?

_____

_____

VII. Do you feel that the program will become a viable force in the enhancement of the teacher's (a) role, (b) value to the system, (c) stature?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

VIII. What is your feeling about the overall value of the program?

_____

_____

_____

IX. Comments and suggestions.

_____

_____

_____

INTERVIEW GUIDE: PRINCIPAL

MCOP - MAY 1990

I. "Break the ice".

II. Do you feel that the MCOP program is superior or inferior to the traditional methods that have been used for new teachers in your system?

III. Did you get adequate support in your efforts?

IV. Do you feel that your role in planning and preparation were adequate?

V. What was the value of the mentor role?

VI. What was the value of the principal with regard to the program?